AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION:

Please amend the paragraph beginning at page 1, line 4, as follows:

This application is based on and incorporates herein by reference Japanese Patent Applications No. 2003-54082 filed on February 28, 2003 and No. 2003-423583 ~~field~~filed on December 19, 2003.

Please amend the paragraph beginning at page 2, line 9, as follows:

~~An~~It is possible that an automatically-generated control program can ~~possibly be given~~ newly provide an execution sequence of processing defined by a control model which may not ~~be given~~correspond inherently to the control model.

Please amend the paragraph beginning at page 3, line 3, as follows:

In order to achieve the object, a control program testing method and a control program testing apparatus are designed to produced operation results of simulation which simulates the operation of a control model and operation results of program execution which executes the control program, while making a relational linkage between individual corresponding operation results, and tests the presence or absence of abnormality in at least one of the control model and the control program.

Please amend the paragraph beginning at page 5, line 3, as follows:

Next, step 102 produces automatically a control program, which is written in the C language for example, from the control model. This control program ~~is given~~newly provides an

execution sequence of processing defined by the control model which is not given inherently

~~depending on~~from the control model.

Please amend the paragraph beginning at page 7, line 10, as follows:

FIG. 4 shows an example of the control program which have been produced

automatically from the control model shown in FIG. 3. As shown in FIG. 4, even though the

processing for Block 3 of the control model shown in FIG. 3 needs to take place prior to the

processing for Block 5, it takes place after the processing for Block 5. This is caused because the

control model is not necessarily given inherently the execution sequence of processing indicated

by functional blocks, but the execution sequence is ~~given~~newly provided by the automatic code

generation section 12. Namely, FIG. 4 shows the case where the control model has not been

given the execution sequence of the processing of Block 5 and Block 3 and the sequence

arrangement by the automatic code generation section 12 does not result in a proper model.

Please amend the paragraph beginning at page 19, line 10, as follows:

This embodiment is designed to determine with the synchronizing section 26 (comparing

section) as to whether or not the suspend point of control model and the suspend point of control

program are in correspondence with each other. Consequently, when the control program

generated by the automatic code generation section 12 ~~is given~~newly provides an execution

sequence for multiple processing defined by the control model, it is possible to detect the

improperness of the sequence.